



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,566	09/22/2000	Takafumi Nakamura	197689US2	9678
22850	7590	04/08/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DI GRAZIO, JEANNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

24

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/667,566	Applicant(s) NAKAMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeanne A. Di Grazio	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE 14 Jan. 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Priority to Japanese Patent Applications 11-271173 (Sept. 24, 1999) and 2000-281164 (Sept. 18, 2000) is claimed.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 14, 2005 has been entered.

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 (conventional liquid crystal displays) should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 7, Applicant recites “a third wiring layer connected to an upper electrode connected to said pixel electrode and said switching elements.”

Such a recitation is unclear at least for the following reasons. First, Applicant has claimed a plurality of different electrodes. Thus, it cannot be determined to what the “upper electrode” refers. Second, it is not clear from the limitation whether just the third wiring layer is connected to the upper electrode or whether the combination of third wiring layer, upper electrode, pixel electrode and switching electrodes are all mutually connected together. Third, it is not clear as to what type of connections are made – whether these are electrical or ohmic connections.

For examination purposes, the Examiner presumes that the limitation is met by the current art of record.

Appropriate correction is **required**.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 10, it is not clear as to what the upper electrode refers.

For examination purposes, the Examiner presumes that said limitation is met by the current art of record.

Appropriate correction is **required**.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Applicant recites that a length of said first wiring layer is set to be equal to that of the second wiring layer. Such recitation is unclear because it is not known whether a comparison is made of lengths or made of other features of the respective layers.

For examination purposes, the Examiner presumes that said limitation is met by the current art of record.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of United States Patent 5,668,650 (to Mori et al.).

As to claim 7, APA Figures 1 and 2 illustrate a conventional liquid crystal display having signal lines and scanning lines longitudinally and transversely arranged on an insulating substrate (Figure 1, and insulating substrate 1 and 4), a plurality of pixel electrodes (19) connected to respective intersections of said signal lines and said scanning lines via switching elements (not illustrated), a plurality of auxiliary capacity electrodes (3) electrically connected to said switching elements (not shown) and an auxiliary capacity feeder (6) disposed opposite to said auxiliary capacity electrode (3) via an insulating film (9).

APA does not appear to explicitly specify a first wiring layer connected to said auxiliary capacity electrode and a third wiring layer connected to an upper electrode connected to said pixel electrode and said switching elements and that the first wiring layer is formed on a layer closer to the lower side of the array substrate than the second wiring layer and the second wiring layer is formed on a layer closer to the upper side of the array substrate than the first wiring layer.

Mori teaches and discloses a thin film transistor panel having an extended source electrode in which (referring to Figure 2) a gate electrode (GE) and gate line (Lg) are connected to an auxiliary electrode (AG) and capacitance compensation electrode (CE)(Applicant's "a first wiring layer connected to said auxiliary capacity electrode"), a source and drain (SE and DE) connected to said switching elements (3) and gate electrode (Applicant's "a second wiring layer connected to said switching elements and said first wiring layer") and a third wiring layer (data line Ld). Furthermore, Mori shows that the gate electrode is on the lower side of the array substrate while the source, drain and switching elements are located towards the upper side of the array substrate (See Figure 2).

This configuration (as shown in Figure 2) results in total gate-source capacitance or sum of capacitance between facing portions of the gate electrode and source electrode and capacitance between facing portions of the auxiliary electrode and capacitance compensation electrode to be constant regardless of a variation in position of source electrode (Abstract, entire patent).

Mori is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to include a first wiring layer connected to said auxiliary capacity electrode and a third wiring layer connected to an upper electrode connected to said pixel electrode and said switching elements and that the first wiring layer is formed on a layer closer to the lower side of the array substrate than the second wiring layer and the second wiring layer is formed on a layer closer to the upper side of the array substrate than the first wiring layer for constant capacitance regardless of the position of the source electrode.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify APA in view of Mori to cancel a change in gate-source capacitance due to alignment error and for the other above noted reasons (Abstract, entire patent).

As to claim 8, the source / drain and switching elements are not superimposed upon the capacitance compensation electrode (Figure 2).

As to claim 9, the gate electrode is formed on the same layer as the auxiliary electrode (Figure 2).

As to claim 10, source / drain / switching elements and data lines are presumed to be formed on a same layer as an upper electrode.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 11, the length of the gate electrode is presumed to be equal to that of source / drain switching elements.

As to claim 12, Mori teaches and discloses the use of I and n type semiconductor films).

As to claim 17, the switching elements in clued gate, drain and source electrodes and drain and data lines are connected to the switching elements (Figure 2).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanne A. Di Grazio whose telephone number is (571)272-2289.


The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim, can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeanne Andrea Di Grazio
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2871

JDG


ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800